6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

of rule. The defeat or death of the ruler, as much as lack of constant external pressures, are likely to bring about a sudden disintegration of a political structure based on such foundations. 121 181

Want of human attachments in the society of these steppe marauders might have been brought about by a strong feeling of insecurity which seems to be rooted in the physical as well as in the social environment of these people. Nomadic horse-breeding in the steppes and deserts, abusive dominance and humiliating submission in a despotic family organization, autocratic political system, sharply stratified social structure, and predatory warfare of enemy tribes present constant physical and emotional threats which breed deep fears, anxieties, lack of trust and violent hostilities. These conditions are harmful to the growth of social intimacy and to the development of group identifications and solidarities; they are likely to favor formation of a self-centered personality and to foster an urge for extreme power-seeking and destructive action as a means of personal survival. [154]

Contrasted to the society of these power-oriented and predatory warriors of the steppes, was the group-oriented and anarchic culture of the Old-Slavonic soil cultivators, spreading since remote times over the forest plains and along the river valleys between the upper Volga and the Carpathians. This society represented a stable system of self-contained and autonomous small agricultural communities with equalitarian social and family organization, diffused social power, lack of central political authority, lack of sharp economic or social stratification and lack of coerciveness. Interpersonal and institutional relationships in these communities promoted group intimacy and social cohesion; they discouraged self-seeking, destructive aggressiveness and warlike qualities. But as the nomadic warriors, in the course of their centuries-old invasions, were imposing their rule over this egalitarian and stateless social system, significant changes were taking place in the Old-Slavonic world; these have formed the basis for the formation and the growth of Russian society. [156]

One of the most important innovations consisted of the formation of a ruling class of conquerors whose whole view of life was in complete contrast to the social and political philosophy of the

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

These feuds did not affect only the relations between local lords; intense strifes and vendettas were flourishing within the family of each one of the princes. Struggle for power and expansion often caused fratricidal warfare among the brothers after the death of their father. The old chronicles and other historical documents are full of examples of such family feuds. Murder, torture and blinding among the brothers and even between fathers and sons apparently were frequent.[20] The life of each one of these local potentates was spent in perpetual warfare, in feuding, and in plundering adventures.[21]

Power-thirstiness, factionalism, and rule of crude force prevailed among these petty rulers in no lesser way than among their nomadic predecessors and overlords. The internal system of rule on the domains of each prince was not more advanced. As the Russian written laws of that period testify, the killing of prince's representatives on the part of the peasants must have been frequent. City populace often rose in riots and revolutionary outbursts against the oppressive conditions imposed by these lords.[22] It was such conditions of physical, social and emotional insecurity that favored perpetuation of the institutions, practices, and other behavior traits which were introduced by the nomadic invaders and conquerors.

III

The changes that in the course of several centuries were taking place in social and psychological structure of the Old-Slavonic world as a result of the imposition of the rule of the nomadic warriors seem to have been well reflected in the Great-Russian folklore, especially in its epic legends. The military, the peasants, the burghers, their conflicts and their character traits are personified in these narratives by a number of popular heroes.[23]

The general picture which these folk documents present shows that the social stability which existed in the Old-Slavonic society was completely shattered as a result of nomadic invasions and conquests. The invading warriors not only caused great havoc but they provoked rapid and fundamental changes in the structure of the old society. Moreover the social disorganization and the political and economic instability that resulted out of these

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

events were apparently manifested in a widespread sense of emotional and physical insecurity which fostered destructive aggression and mass violence. In such circumstances extreme self-seeking and dominance-submission relationships tended to substitute the Old-Slavonic egalitarian and anarchic system.

The plight of the Slavonic peasant strata has been symbolized in these products of folk imagination in the person of Mikula Selyaninovich ("the Villager's son") and in that of Ilya of Murom, who is often referred to as "the peasant's son," and as "the old Cossak." Mikula is pictured as a superb plowman and field laborer. He has a keen knowledge of husbandry and possesses the best mares and the best farming equipment.[24] He is endowed with such tremendous strength and is entrusted with such heavy responsibility that he carries "the weight of the whole world" in a little shoulder bag. This villager, however, comes into conflict with the city people over the custom duties and over the haughty manner of the urbanites. The tolls imposed by the city are too high. Moreover, the burghers treat Mikula in a despicable and undignified way. So he is enraged and loses his self-control:

> I was in the city no longer ago than the day before yesterday,
> On my light bay mare,
> I carried thence two whole bags of salt,
> Two bags of salt of forty pud each.
> The folk there are no better than robbers.
> They demand two kopecks toll;
> But I had a leaded whip for toll
> I paid their two kopecks toll.
> Whoever was upright I left seated
> And whoever was seated I left prostrate,
> And whoever lay prostrate would never rise again.[25]

As a result of such conflicts, Mikula finally came to the conclusion that tilling was not profitable any more. He found that there were other and better ways which would guarantee to one safety, economic gain, and self-respect. So he gave up husbandry and joined Volga Buslavlevich, the bandit-warrior. In his new role in which he uses great physical power not as a productive force, but as a means of coercion, he makes a strong imprint on

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

attractive forest fairies who used to help travelers changed into beastly demons who trick wayfarers into making them lose their way and then cause them to perish.

The imposition of the rule of nomadic warriors over the soil cultivators brought about not only insecurity of life and property, but disintegration of the old ways of life and of the old morals. Social disintegration favored detachment from the group, caused decline in group identification and solidarity, tended to increase self-concern, fostered destructive aggressiveness and anti-social behavior. Hence, drunkenness, debauchery, orgiastic practices, together with robbing and killing, became prominent. According to Fedotov, the old Christian sermons are so full of invectives against such behavior that some studies of Russia's religious life consider that these themes formed the main content of anti-pagan literature of those days.[53]

Perhaps as a result of such social disorganization the Old-Slavonic Goddess of Love (Lada) was relegated into the background and obscurity. Instead, male gods of bacchanalian passion and Dionysiac orgy (Iarilo, Pereplut) became outstanding in folk imagination.[54] A phallic rite was observed at wedding banquets and sexual promiscuity during the feast gathering of young people became prominent, according to the old sermons.[55]

It was under these conditions of social disorganization and insecurity, and ascendency of power-oriented patriarchal system over the old stateless, semi-matriarchal and equalitarian order that the attitudes toward women changed radically. Mounting hostilities generated by conditions of strife and insecurity can be vented not only through inordinate sex life, alcoholism and delinquency, but also by aggressive behavior against all the unprotected and the weak. And just as sex life tended to take the form of lechery, and love that of uncontrolled passion, the attitudes toward the women changed from respect and reserve to that of scorn and contempt. They came to be looked upon as impure and unclean physically and morally.[56]

It is possible that the new unsatisfactory social conditions might have also affected the concept of the Christian God and attitude toward death. Not only did popular imagination in conditions of disorganization and insecurity tend to see in this

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

of the Czar, they became increasingly rank-conscious, domineering and abusive toward all lower in rank or under their power.[12]

Such a ruling class, with its open misrule and arbitrariness, could not inspire the subjected classes with confidence and respect. The lack of social and political security was manifested in want of initiative, in disinterest in productive activities, in loose morals, in hazard games, in a low value of human life, and in a general lack of trust.[13]

On the other hand, perhaps as a reaction to these conditions of insecurity and of social disorganization, there was an urge of complete renunciation of the world and its strife, an urge to detach oneself from the group, a tendency to isolate oneself completely from human society and seek personal consolation and personal salvation in religion. This trend of social withdrawal and self-oriented feelings brought about a great development of hermitism and of monastic life. Many of these people, completely detached from human society and preoccupied exclusively with their own self, sought peace and communion with God in lonely, remote depths of forests, in the solitude of the wilds and deserts. Here "far removed from men" they spent their lives in prayer, fasting and self-maceration.

At the same time the masses of the people who lived in great misery and who were exposed to arbitrariness, exploitation, and other forms of oppression on the part of the mighty, sought consolation and hope in supernatural forces. Beliefs in miraculous powers of wonder-working icons and in life-giving properties of the Cross were taking deep roots. On all sides sprang up prophecies and apparitions. Saint men and prophets, often mentally unbalanced, would appear in the streets and openly voice their protest against the Czar and his government.[14]

These were the only signs of an open opposition to the existing system that was becoming increasingly unbearable. Such "idiots" were considered saintly by the people not only because of their strange behavior and their ability to endure extremes of hardship, but also for their unheard of courage to speak openly against the Czar:

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

the favors of one's superiors that one hoped to exercise more power and to achieve a higher degree of security.

Such a situation often demanded self-abasing and cringing humility toward superiors in the hierarchy as an adjustment to a situation of permanent insecurity and threat. ". . . those employed believe that they can never do enough to show their zeal."[9] "Without being base, it is impossible to get on," the officials themselves would say.[9] At the same time, perhaps as a compensation for degradation and loss of self-respect, there developed the propensity of the officials to show haughtiness and arrogance to those below them in rank and status. "A man, as soon as he rises a grade above the common level, acquires the right . . . to maltreat his inferiors to whom it is his duty to transmit the blows that he receives from those above him."[10]

In such conditions preoccupation with one's self rather than interest in group ideals and objectives thrived. There was therefore a tendency for selfish and petty concerns, greediness, venality, and corruption. Careerism prevailed over loyalty. Fortunes were made by many in public service as a security for the uncertain future.[11] The public opinion itself supported such behavior because it was expected that people who acquire office or any other positions of trust would take personal advantage of the situation. In some departments because of the inadequacy of the salaries and in order to meet the expected high standards of living the officials were considered to have tacit permission to have recourse to illicit perquisites. Administration, justice, police, the army and the navy, and even the clergy, all had their acknowledged perquisites, which often included bribes.[12]

In such conditions in which extreme self-concern thrived, the Czar himself did not feel safe and secure. This sense of insecurity on the very peak of power was reflected, for instance, in the tendency of the Czars not to tolerate any outstanding personalities in their midst.[13] The same feeling was reflected in the idea that any concession on the part of the Czar would be considered as a sign of weakness. The result was that the Czar was often surrounded by sycophants and careerists and had no close friends whom he could trust and on whom he could rely for support at all times. In such circumstances the Czar might feel isolated,

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

was invested with the most extensive powers and was given as its special mission the task of looking after the safety of the state and overseeing the doings of all departments, of all public functionaries, and of all people. The security police was an omnipotent and all-powerful body before whom all subjects were considered guilty unless they proved the contrary. This institution—developed in the course of centuries—became of paramount importance to its rulers. It became one of the most essential wheels of the government and one of the chief cares of the ruling class.[16]

III

Hierarchical relations of strict superordination and subordination in the military and bureaucratic ranks might foster feelings of identification with the mighty and the powerful. It is on such grounds that imperialistic nationalism and ideas of national superiority and grandeur thrive. And when state is fused with the Church in a system of theocratic militarism then nationalism might acquire also the aspects of religious fanaticism.

Expansion, greatness of the state, ideas of grandeur and Messianic ideas of world redemption or world domination might provide also compensation for humiliations, self-abasement, feelings of inferiority and unworthiness and other frustrations which are fostered in a system of abusive domineering-subservience relationships. As a result love of show, display of military might and need for conquests preoccupied the ruling strata of post-Petrine Russia as much as those of the Muscovite state. The Czar's court, the nobility, the military, the bureaucracy, the Church, the cities and the villages tended to display a grandeur that was in sharp contrast with the poverty of the country.[17]

This tendency toward exhibitionism and ideas of greatness was manifested also in the glorification of Russia, and the belief in the sacredness of its exalted mission in the world. Such attitudes and feelings which were rooted in the rigidly hierarchical military and bureaucratic structure were supported also by the Third Rome traditions of the Russian Church according to which Providence itself had bestowed upon Russia's rulers the role of the redeemers of mankind. According to these traditions and teachings Russia was a God-chosen country, the only country

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RFl Great Russia RFl

failures and their sins would fall upon him. He was emotionally and socially dependent upon the members of his family, yet he had to be stern and distant to maintain his authority.

At the same time, the family members were expected to completely identify themselves with the family as a whole. This submerging of the individual in the family collective was manifested, for instance, in the ideas of common family good, rooted in the Old-Slavonic principles of mutual reponsibility and mutual aid of all community members ("all for one, one for all"). The elder brothers were expected to take care of their minor brothers and of their unmarried sisters; the aged or disabled parents were in the care of their children; the father was expected to maintain his daughter-in-law if she lost her husband or if her husband were away.[1]

Earlier, following Mongol traditions, the family was collectively responsible for the misdeeds or crimes of any one of its members.[2] In early Russia, according to the Expanded Version of the *Pravda,* "if anyone attacks and kills another without the slightest provocation, the inhabitants of the district do not make payment for this kind of a murderer, but they shall surrender him, with his wife and children, for sentencing to banishment or imprisonment, and his home shall be given up for plundering."[3] Also later in Muscovite Russia all members of a family were considered involved in the offense of a member.

This complete identification with one's family and this penal philosophy of collective responsibility, of implied collective culpability and family hostages (retained in Russian police practices until nowadays) favored family self-centeredness and self-concern. There was therefore a tendency to draw a curtain of secrecy around the family in order not to expose it to accusations and to protect it from defamation. In the urban strata the master of the household was very much preoccupied with this problem. "Your neighbors will reproach you, and your enemies will rejoice at your misfortune," warns Domostroy. Such family centeredness, which was a result of the ascendency of an autocratic state, favored social isolation and lack of intimate contact with neighbors; hence, it fostered also lack of social trust.

Family centrism, family isolation, and lack of trust in one's

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RFI Great Russia RFI

592 Family centrism, family isolation, and lack of trust in one's
771 neighbor were apparently projected into the supernatural world
776 where one's own Domovoy, though at times arbitrary, ill-tempered and spiteful, was generally considered to be benevolent—bringing good luck to the household which was under his care and solicitude. The neighbor's Domovoy, on the other hand, was always a malevolent and wicked being who could never be propitiated and who was likely to steal your hay or drive away your cattle for the benefit of the home which was under his protection.
[789] The Russian peasants, therefore, developed means of defense against the neighbor's Domovoy in the form of spells and exorcisms.

● 156 Lack of social trust is not favorable to the development of
621 solidarity within a community. Therefore lack of group identi-
578 fication among the peasants and burghers, the same as the lack of the *esprit de corps* among the nobility, contributed to the perpetuation of the autocratic rule. Lack of communal identifications was an obstacle to the turning of group hostilities against the ruling classes. In such circumstances a great deal of personal aggressiveness had to find outlets and targets within the local community and within the family circle itself. Only when the authorities suffered crushing defeat and loss of prestige the hostilities would turn against them and mass uprisings would take place, demanding re-establishment of old communal values.

With the ascendancy of the otsovskaya system, family relations came to be organized in a hierarchical system along the lines of paternity, marriage status, seniority and sex. At one time, only married male members formed the family council (soviet). The males had priority over the females. Within each sex category the elder had priority rights over the younger. When the family was partitioned, custom demanded that the older brothers leave
[428] the ancestral home while the youngest, following Mongol tradi-
[582] tions, remained on the paternal *koren* (root).[4] In marrying the daughters it was the eldest who had to be married first.

593 In the patriarchal family, in their relations to the father, all family members were expected to accept his rule with fear and awe (*strakh*) and with humility (*smirenie*). They had to show absolute submission and blind obedience (*besprekoslovnoe povinovenie*),[5] as well as love and gratitude (*blagodarnost*).[6]

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

[Dobrolyubov]

humiliating treatment which Dobrolyubov experienced at the hands of his father. As a reaction to such a family situation, Dobrolyubov developed strong needs for emotional attachment and felt very disillusioned and deeply embittered when his need for dependency was frustrated. When he was sixteen years of age this "forerunner of Bolshevism" wrote in his diary:

> No matter how many attachments I had formed in the past, always the evil fate would whisk the beloved being far away from me; and in my soul remains only the sorrowful memory and bitter realization of my despair . . . I could never live without love, without attachment to someone. This has been so ever since I remember myself. But this constant irony of fate, which makes all my hopes and dreams usually crash into dirt, constantly hardens and chills my heart, and there is nothing surprising in the fact that soon it will be both hard and cold as stone.[5]

Later, apparently, Dobrolyubov found an outlet for his repressed hostilities, in his writings in which he tended to emphasize the dark sides of Russian society ("Realm of Darkness"). He joined that group of "Nihilists" who excelled in their philosophy of extreme individualism, who attacked the existing society and devised the ways to destroy "coldbloodedly" its very foundations, including the family. It was in this ideology of "Nihilism" that Russian Anarchism as well as Bolshevism have been rooted.

The demand for unlimited power as a means of compensation for humiliations and deprivations and as a means of satisfying craving for acceptance and support tends to perpetuate a political system which gives one a chance to indulge such needs through relationships of absolute dominance and unconditional submission and through destructive action. Such a social and political structure, in its own turn, tends to reinforce paternal despotism and absolute obedience in the family. In this manner, just as in the society of steppe marauders, power-seeking, mistrust and destructive aggression are perpetuated, become generalized and are manifested in many social relations.

On the folk level desire for power was manifested, for instance, in the customs connected with childbirth. On that occasion the midwife would place the child on a sheepskin coat or furcoat so

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

ness and ruthlessness both toward themselves and toward those who were not with them became in this manner an integral part of the revolutionary movement in Russia.[15] On such foundations a "science of merciless destruction" was developed:

> The revolutionary is wholly dedicated. He must show no mercy to the State or towards the civilized classes of society; nor does he ask for mercy for himself. Between him and society there is waged a mortal war declared or concealed, a relentless and irreconcilable fight to the death. He must accustom himself to torture.
>
> Tyrannical towards himself, the revolutionary must be tyrannical towards others. All the emotions that move human beings, all the soft and enervating feelings of kinship, love, friendship, gratitude and honor, must give way to a cold and single-minded passion for revolution. For him there exists only one pleasure, one consolation, one reward, one satisfaction—the success of the revolution. Night and day he must have but one thought, but one aim—merciless destruction. Coldly, relentlessly, he pursues his aim, and he must be prepared to perish himself, as he must be prepared to destroy with his own hands those who stand in his way.[16]

A revolutionary organization engaged in a life and death struggle with the rest of society precluded any internal disagreement. Bakunin, for instance, conceived a secret organization with a disciplined membership, a system of strict control of its members, and a rigidly centralized authority vested in one man only. Bakunin's secret society was to consist of three separate and independent groups which would function under different names and would be unacquainted with one another. Each one of these three groups was to operate in a different stratum of society. But each group was to be subject to a rigid hierarchy of power and each member of the group subjected to unconditional obedience to his superiors.

These secret societies were to be limited to a small number of people and were to include, as far as possible, only able, experienced, energetic, and influential men, professional conspirators, who, in strict obedience to a central control would lead the masses. All three secret societies were to be coordinated by a central committee which would have consisted of Bakunin and of three or four other members selected by him. Bakunin wanted

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

623 a few kulaks were often able to force the commune members into unanimous decision by means of threats or bribing. And there was no appeal against such decisions.

565 621 154 In such circumstances many land communes tended to lose their former equalitarian and protective aspects and the peasants came to fear the mir and to feel an awe before it as much as they had a fear and awe before God and the Czar or before a stern and distant father. They feared the overwhelming power of the mir, the finality of its decision, and the lack of redress against its will They tended to identify the mir's final power with that of Almighty God. "There is no court for the mir, one God is its judge," they would say. Feeling helpless in the front of such an [156] uncontrollable power, there seemed to be nothing else for the peasants to do but to submit to its will. "One cannot argue with the mir"; "Mir will stand for itself, you cannot go against it" they would say. And since there was no other way out for one but to be a part of such an overwhelming and capricious institution the most expedient way of behavior for him was to accept it and to do as the others do. "Although bad, you cannot do without it"; "If you have to live with wolves you might as well howl as they do."[11]

621 625 156 The mir and police were empowered to interfere not only in the system of planting, sowing, and harvesting, but in family and personal affairs as well. The problems of paternal authority and filial duties, the relations between husband and wife, and between in-laws, the questions of inheritance, military conscription, and general behavior, all were within the grasp of these village authorities.[12] Just as in his own family, the rank-and-file individual was completely lost in his village commune. A rank-and-file man had the right to participate in the debates and was expected to vote unanimously for the regulations which restricted his personal and his economic freedom. He who dared to object was unprotected against the despotism and arbitrariness either of the ruling minority or of an incited mob. Thus the feelings of complete dependence upon superior powers prevailed in the community.

241 In addition, poor quality of land, lack of sufficient moisture, long and hard winters, many years of military service, low

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

Outside the family, however, this system of social relationships tended to lose its protection-dependence character and to emphasize domineering-subservience attitudes in complete contrast to the traditions of and his yearning for an equalitarian and protective folk community that had existed in the past.

In such circumstances his sense of rejection and his demand for acceptance which he might have experienced in the family were reinforced and magnified, affecting his whole view of life, his attitudes toward the world around him and his image of the universe. He was convinced that there was no justice in the world and that there was nobody to whom he could appeal for redress. "Injustice and untruth rule the world"; "Injustice and untruth started with the world and will end with the world," he would say.[1]

In such circumstances the peasant was inclined to see the wrathful, the revengeful, and the implacable aspect of God, especially since such image of a Christian God had support in the teachings of the Russian Orthodoxy. Accordingly the peasant visioned the saints who surrounded the Old Man as quarrelling among themselves and bragging about their strength and achievements and as being vindictive, cheating, and playing tricks on one another.[2] Since the peasant pictured Christ as being only the son of a wrathful Father, he could not depend upon him according to the Russian view of patriarchal family relationships. The Russian peasant therefore had a "sympathetic but detached view of Christ."[3]

The peasant's feeling of rejection in regard to God was manifested in his lack of assurance as to the help he could expect from Him. God, to whom he prayed, seldom interfered on his behalf against earthly authorities. And though "All power was from God," the peasant knew that "God gives power to whom he wants to." The peasant was therefore at times openly resentful of God's neglect. "God neither lets you live nor die," he would say. In his despair he was inclined to believe that there were other forces, beside God, which ruled the universe, such as the Devil who was looked upon as "the junior brother of God and his carpenter in the creation of the universe."[4] And, not unlike Asiatic steppe herders who lived in similar circumstances, the

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

The peasant therefore appraised the social environment in which he lived as dominated by powerful destructive forces which were capricious, neglectful and inimical but upon which he was completely dependent for his life and livelihood. He strongly resented these powers and wished he could destroy them, but felt helpless before them. He therefore projected his feelings of helplessness as well as his destructive urges into the supernatural world and proceeded to inhabit that world with all-powerful, arbitrary, and vicious beings which sought the annihilation of man, and of the earth.

II

On the family level in similar circumstances, two contrasting tendencies, that of complete submission to the parental power and that of rebellion against it are likely to be formed. In a like manner submission and rebellion characterized the behavior of the Russian peasantry on the local community level. The peasant was inclined to appear servile and docile toward all authorities. He would address every one of his superiors as "Father" (*batyushka*). He would bow low (*klanyatsya v poyas*) or in twain (*klanyatsya v nogi*) before them. Before the Czar he would prostrate himself (*chelobitye*) and if the Czar was passing by he would fall on his knees and cross himself. All he could hope for was that by offering unconditional obedience or by propitiating the powers that be, he would be spared. And if all this appeasing of the authorities were in vain he would refrain from revolt as long as he realized that he was utterly helpless and without support in the front of overwhelming powers. In such circumstances he tended to become completely resigned and fatalistic. He might arrive at the conclusion that "You cannot run away from fate, not even on horse-back," and that "Unto each man happens what was decreed at his birth."[9]

With such a frame of mind the Russian peasant was ready to accept great suffering without much complaint. "Misfortune is like the ocean: neither you can swim across it nor can you draw it out," he would say. "And who is it that was not visited by misfortune and misery?" he would ask. Therefore since "You cannot escape misery," "Do not struggle with misery, but suffer"

6. Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

(*S bedoyu ne perekoryaisya, terpi!*). And then if life is all suffering, why be afraid of death, he would ask himself. "Be afraid to live, do not be afraid to die! To live is more terrible than to die"; "We do not rejoice in life, but in death."[10]

Identification with suffering and preoccupation with death which has been conditioned by family experiences and reinforced on the community level led the Russian peasants to practice long and hard fasts, and to undertake difficult pilgrimages to far off places of worship. "There is only one salvation, fast and prayer"; "We don't live on bread, but on prayer" they would say. Long and hard fasting and prayer of the Great-Russian peasants were not only manifestations of his identification with suffering and his feeling of helplessness and complete dependency upon superior forces, but were perhaps also expressions of his tendency to completely retire from an unsatisfactory and an unhappy world.

The extremes of this suffering and withdrawal from the world were reached by anchorites who sought complete solitude in wild deserts "far away from men," and by those hermits who lived self-buried in the catacombs, away not only from man, but also from the light of day. Such people enjoyed among the peasants the fame of saints and were believed to possess miraculous powers. Many peasants would make vows of pilgrimage to places where such people lived self-buried, isolated and withdrawn from all human contact.

III

The peasant's complete submission to unpredictable and arbitrary forces was enhanced because of the lack of solidarity among the peasants themselves. After the peasant had been subjected to arbitrary regimentation and to permanent policing on the part of the authorities, he began to lose faith not only in the authorities but in his fellow peasants as well. Thus mistrust and suspiciousness rooted in patriarchal relations were heightened. In such circumstances the peasant became increasingly distrustful of his neighbors, tended to withdraw within his own family and to become himself ready to spy on others.[11]

In such conditions when isolated, helpless and self-oriented,

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RFI Great Russia RFI

the peasant tended to conceive of every man as a dangerous fellow. "Ruddy or red, the man is dangerous" (*Ryzhyi da krasnyi chelovek opasnyi*), he would say. He did not think he could expect any help from man. "Do not expect any good from a human being," he would advise. And between a living man and a dead one, he thought that the latter was preferred. "No evil comes from a dead man, and no good comes from a living one," he would assert. Many Great-Russian folk sayings emphasize the need for silence, or the necessity to spare words, so that one may not betray himself and let the others take advantage of him. "Do not say every word! Do not reveal every little thought when people are near!" these maxims caution. They also warn: "Do not believe every talk, do not tell every truth!"[12]

But such a lack of faith in human beings might lead to the resolution that one is quite justified to take advantage of everyone else, since all others would do the same to him. Thus social isolation and mistrust tended to reinforce self-seeking and encourage the use of all means to achieve one's personal ends: "Lie began with the world and with the world it will die," the peasants would say. They concluded that since "Man lives by falsehood, we too should not remain behind." Their advice therefore was: "Do not mourn for truth, make terms with falsehood"; "It is by falsehood that men live."[13]

The Great-Russian peasant was accordingly often forced to rely on deliberate deceit as a means of survival in a hostile, distrustful, and unreliable world. He did not consider it necessary to have any respect for agreements, contract obligations or given pledges. He tended to be crafty even in his dealings with God and saints. When committing sinful acts at home he would cover his icons. A number of Russian folk tales are concerned with cunning and show how profitable it might be for one to resort to such means.[14] Heroes in folk epics are addicted to deceit and are condoned for their deeds of guile. Merchants in peasant villages almost invariably used false weights and measures. Perjury was so frequent that there were people whose sole profession it was to swear falsely.[15]

While in such an aggressive mood the peasant was inclined to evoke to his help the dark forces. As a result there was a great

3: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

[538]
795
771

• • •

Why then in deeds of faith
Measures of compulsion
And all kinds of constraint?

• • •

Why then is this?[5]

795
641

Protest against the existing conditions of abusive dominance and subservient submission and longing for acceptance on terms of anarchic equality seems to have been the driving power behind the ideologies of a number of Great-Russian religious sects, such as the *Dukhobortsy* (the spirit-wrestlers), and the *Molokane* (the milk-drinkers). Not unlike the Nihilists and the Anarchists (whose reaction was also rooted in feelings of rejection), all these sects showed a strong resentment against abusive and distant authorities. At first the religious dissenters attacked the Church authorities but then this anti-authority attitude was generalized and extended to all the authorities, including the family, the landlords, the state and the Czar.

As a result all the authorities were blamed for the existing social ills and their removal was considered necessary in order to achieve a better life. There was no need for official clergy, courts, churches, sacraments, fasts, confession, communion, or any Church rituals except simple hymn singing, these sects said. There was no need for the Czar either, they claimed. Anything that smacked of authority and power was rejected. "We behold what a spirit of impiety works and shall work to the end of the world in all holders of power," they stated.[6] In 1868, a sect decreed that anyone who prays for the existing authorities shall be excommunicated. Now all the authorities, not just the priests, were identified with the beasts! "How will you ever find grace at the hands of the Beast?" A number of these sects identified the Czar with the Anti-Christ.

795
156

In their reaction against the suppression of the individual in the interest of those who hold power and in their strongly felt need for acceptance on terms of complete equality, the Dukhobortsy—not unlike the Nihilists—proclaimed the supremacy and the sanctity of the individual. Their demand for an anarchic acceptance was manifested in the emphasis of the

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

worth and dignity of the individual above all other values; the Dukhobortsy claimed that every human being was a god. "God is spirit; he is in us; then we are gods."[7]

Disapproval of oppressive authority on the family level led the Dukhobortsy to repudiate even the names of "father" and "mother." They therefore did not call their parents "father" and "mother," but only "old man" and "old woman." In the same way a father would not say of his children "mine," but "ours."[8] Proscribing the existing degrading subjection of the wife to her husband the Dukhobortsy—not unlike the early Slavs—stressed the complete equality of men and women, husbands and wives. "Among us a woman is not a beast of burden, but a helpmate and standby, a friend and companion in this vale of misery," the Molokane would say.[9] The men called their wives "sisters."

To satisfy their demands for complete acceptance and anarchic relations the Molokane attempted to build a society in which all things were to be possessed in common, and in which the evangelic principles of charity and equality, and the gospel of peace, truth and justice would reign supreme and forever.[10] They felt that it was only in such a communistic society that complete acceptance of all on equal terms could be achieved.

II

Just as in the ideology and practices of Russian monasticism, in some sects of the Dissenters reaction against the oppressive conditions and feeling of utter rejection took the form of extreme social withdrawal. For instance, the *Straniki* (wanderers) proscribed marriage and all family ties, and sought salvation in isolation and flight as the only way to avoid any contact with "Satan's representatives," that is, with the authorities. They would destroy and reject passports and all papers of identification, admit of no social distinction or ties, renounce private property and tramp from village to village, living by theft or by the hospitality of their sympathizers who provided food and secret shelter for them. "Have no city, no village, no home," they would advise.[11]

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

795 Another manifestation of withdrawal from degrading oppression was expressed by the *Molchalniki* (speechless) or *Bezslovestnye* (mutes), the sect whose members refused to speak. The moment one would join this sect he would suddenly become dumb and nothing could force even a syllable from his lips. The government was unable to obtain any information from such voluntary martyrs,[12] even under extreme torture.[13] The Theodosians and the Denisovtsy manifested feelings of dejection and withdrawal by means of complete asceticism. These sects demanded celibacy and abstinence not only from bachelors, but from married people as well. ("Let the unwedded wed not, the wedded separate"). The members of these sects therefore founded settlements which were organized along monastic lines, where they attempted to live a solitary life of complete seclusion in the wilderness, and far away from worldly authorities.[14]

On the other hand, some sects apparently reacted to the existing unsatisfactory conditions by various forms of destructive aggressiveness, including self-destruction. The *Skoptsy* (castrated), for instance, practiced castration and mutilation of sex organs.[15] Other sects preached and practiced mass assassination and mass immolation. The *Detoubiytsy* (infant-killers), preached and practiced infanticide. The *Dushilshchiki* (stranglers) or *Tyukalshchiki* (clubbers) preached and practiced killing of adults.[16] Other sects, such as the *Samoszhigateli* (self-cremators) of *Morelshchiki* (self-immolators), organized mass immolation. Cases of such acts of extreme destructiveness have occurred until the end of the nineteenth century, and in the most different and distant parts of the Empire where the Great-Russians are settled.[17] As among the Anarchists, there was among these people an urge for pan-destruction:

> I wish that all Romanov, every man, wife, and child, would come to the banks of the Volga, throw themselves into the waters, and sink to the bottom so that the temptations of the world should not attract them. And what is even better: that I might set fire to and burn down the entire city;—what joy if it were to burn from end to end destroying all the aged and infants, so that none could receive the stamp of Antichrist.[18]

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

commands and impose punishments. "If an order is given it must be carried out absolutely."[26] In order to achieve such absolute, unconditional and unquestioning obedience, the training of the young must be not only strict and firm but also consistent, so that their "habit of obedience" once formed is not easily broken.[27] Training in blind obedience is justified by the need to avoid conflicts and discord which a Soviet society cannot tolerate.[28] In such a society all available human energy must be employed exclusively in building socialism.

In order to develop the habit of unconditional obedience it is necessary to prevent any reflection upon given orders. Therefore the school training must stamp out "indecision" in the Soviet children. "We must create in Soviet children a state of mind which causes them to consider indecision in necessary actions as unworthy of their honor."[29] Obedience and submission demand traits of self-abnegation and self-denial; " . . . to bear pain patiently, to maintain self-control on hearing unpleasant news, and to endure unavoidable privations without complaint . . . all of this means to children a manifestation of courage."[30]

It is recognized that children have to be trained also in leadership, and that initiative is necessary in that respect. The Party, however, cannot allow any such initiative which might go counter to the Party's will. It is emphasized therefore that the initiative, too, must be "disciplined," because it is needed only for purposes of organization, vigilance and struggle along the lines put forward by those who possess the Truth. Hence according to Soviet principles of education it is "important that initiative not be exhibited impulsively, but that it be directed into organized channels . . . out of children of initiative good organizers must come."[31]

This complete submerging of the individual into his group, rooted in the social and political traditions of Russian society, is being reinforced by Soviet school training which strives to "educate people for whom the pronoun *I* could not . . . become more important than *we*, for whom thought for themselves always yields to thought for their comrades, for the group and for the country."[32] In this manner "clash between social demands and personal inclinations" is surmounted and the group

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RFI Great Russia RFI

is "perfected until there are no shortcomings." Then on members of such a group one can make great demands.[83] They will be disciplined, enduring, courageous and faithful. Work will become "second nature" to them; they will not abhor hard effort, nor be afraid of "healthy sweat."[84] They will be industrious and efficient and will develop the "best and most worthy feelings of man," that is, devotion to labor, heroism in the struggle against the forces of reaction, untiring, ruthless and unwavering vigilance against the survivals of capitalism, and an irreconcilable attitude toward the slightest manifestations of deviationism.[85]

III

In the days of Czardom the system of economic and political regimentation found its support in religious sanction and in nationalism. In a like manner the Bolsheviks had early realized that great privations which their regime demands could be best elicited from their subjects with the help of an identification with the great, the absolute, the sublime. It is by such means that traditional cravings for attachment and acceptance could be satisfied. In such a manner also a sense of guilt and urge for self-sacrifice could be reinforced and employed for political purposes.

It is along such efforts that the Bolsheviks have revived and strengthened the traditional Russian images of God, Czar, Father and Mother and have projected these images to the Leader and to the Party. The likeness to God and religion is manifested in the Bolshevik claim of infallibility of their leaders, universality, eternity, and sanctity of their doctrines. Lenin's teachings, for instance, are extolled by the Bolsheviks as being "superior" to any other ideology, as embracing the whole of humanity, and as living forever:

> Lenin's thoughts represent a superior achievement of the Russian and of the world culture; an eternally living and eternally developing science of society—a fighting banner of the working class—living soul of the Bolshevik Party which led our Fatherland to the avant-garde of the whole human kind.
>
> The books of the vozhd and teacher are immortal. They live and

6; Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RFI Great Russia RFI

Many observers of Soviet society have noticed that in this constant struggle for power, and sometimes in order to save their very lives, Soviet officials and intellectuals must be ready not only to inform on each other, but also to "throw mud" at the closest associates and friends as soon as these happen to fall in disgrace.[1] Denunciation of a friend is often "the best way out of a hole," they say. Many "pretend to deny and to disown those who fall in disgrace" or, frightened, "join in verbal lynching to protect themselves." There is a "malignant joy regarding a comrade's mistakes . . . exaggeration of mistakes."[2] They "rush to kick a man who is already down, to push him over the precipice." In such conditions "Friendship is strained with blood and betrayal; it is an object of fear and suspicion."[3] Even members of one's own family might be repudiated under such pressure.[4] At the same time the need for cringing before one's superiors is often compensated by arrogance, capriciousness, arbitrariness, insulting and humiliating treatment of his subordinates or of all unprotected.[5]

The sense of guilt, insecurity, and feelings of humiliation which develop in such circumstances are magnified by means of social isolation. This isolation is manifold in the Soviet society, especially in the upper ruling strata. Intimate personal contact and unfettered social and intellectual intercourse is officially frowned upon and is therefore very limited among the Party, Army, government and managerial hierarchies. Intimate fraternization with associates is looked upon with great suspicion in a society whose ruling minority maintains itself in power by means of planned social divisions and mistrusts. Said Stalin: ". . . such family conditions create a favorable environment for the nurture of reptiles, not Bolsheviks."[6]

Real risks are involved in any free discourse in a society which is infested with watchdogs and informers and in which many are inclined to seek self-advance in the ruin of others. In the upper strata besides fear, suspicion and need for extreme caution, there is lack of intimate contact also because of sharp differentiation in rank. For the same reasons intercourse between the educated and non-educated strata has to be kept to a minimum.

There is also a deliberate policy on the part of the ruling class